

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-7 and 9, all the claims pending in the application, have been finally rejected. Applicants have filed a Notice of Appeal. However, in order to more efficiently advance prosecution, Applicants are filing an RCE with amendments to claims 1 and 6. The amendment of claims 1 and 6 is clearly supported by the description of page 8, lines 24-27 of the original specification.

***Entry and Consideration of Prior Amendment***

Applicants have filed the accompanying RCE and the present amendment because the Examiner, in the Advisory Action dated March 6, 2008, has refused entry of the Amendment filed on November 20, 2007. Entry of the Amendment filed on November 20, 2007 is now required.

Accordingly, the Examiner now is requested to fully consider the arguments made in the amendment filed on November 20, 2007 and the further amendments made in the present filing.

Finally, since Applicants were forced to file the present RCE in order to have the previous amendment entered, if the claims are not considered allowable, any subsequent Office Action cannot be made final.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC 102***

**Claims 1, 3-4, 6-7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Saito et al (6,782,717).** This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

**Saito Does Not Have Post Texturing Irrigation**

In Saito, the treating liquid (col.4, lines 1-4 (colloidal particles)) is the abrasion material used in the chamfering step before the texture is formed. Thus, this treating liquid is **not** used **after the texture is formed**. This fact is apparent from the description of col.3 line 53-col.4 line 4 in Saito.

By contrast, according to the present invention recited in claims 1 and 6, the pure water (treating liquid) is supplied onto the principal surface of the glass substrate **after the texture is**

formed on the principal surface of the glass substrate. Consequently, it is possible to prevent adhesion of foreign matters during cleaning so that the uniformly textured surface is formed. Thus, it is possible to realize the high magnetic anisotropy.

Specifically, the disturbance of the texture formed on the principal surface of the glass substrate is reduced. The surface roughness of the texture has the specific range, i.e.,  $R_{max}$  of 5 nm or less and  $R_p$  of 3 nm or less,  $R_{max}$  representing a maximum height and  $R_p$  representing a maximum peak height, respectively.

**Saito's Tape Is NOT For Cleaning**

In Saito, the tape 23 (namely, the texture formation tape) is used to form the texture as described at col.5 line 66-col.6 line 7 and is not used to clean the principal surface of the glass substrate.

By contrast, according to the present invention recited in claims 1 and 6, the tape is used to clean the principal surface of the glass substrate, not to form the texture.

**Saito Does NOT Teach Stated Range**

(3) Saito fails to disclose the specific range according to the present invention, i.e.,  $R_{max}$  of 5 nm or less and  $R_p$  of 3 nm or less,  $R_{max}$  representing a maximum height and  $R_p$  representing a maximum peak height, respectively.

Specifically, at col.5, lines 45-53, only the average roughness  $R_a$  is disclosed but  $R_{max}$  and  $R_p$  are not disclosed.

At col.6, lines 58-67, only the removal depth are disclosed but  $R_{max}$  and  $R_p$  are not disclosed.

At col.9, lines 66-67 and col.10, lines 27-34, only the maximum depth is disclosed but  $R_{max}$  and  $R_p$  are not disclosed. Herein, the maximum depth represents the acid resistance index and clearly differs from  $R_{max}$  representing a maximum height and  $R_p$  representing a maximum peak height.

As discussed above, for three basic reasons, Saito fails to disclose or suggest the features of the present invention. Accordingly, the present invention cannot be anticipated and is clearly patentable over Saito.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC 103***

**Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito et al (6,782,717) in view of Shimada (6,632,547).** This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

Saito et al is discussed and distinguished above. The Examiner admits that Saito et al does not teach chemical strengthened glass substrates.

Shimada does not remedy the additional deficiencies of Saito et al, as noted above and in the previous Amendment. In particular, Shimada does not teach how or why one skilled in the art would modify Saito et al to add (1) post texturing irrigation (2) use of a tape for cleaning, and (3) the recited ranges for Rmax and Rp.

Since neither reference teaches the claim limitations, this rejection is overcome, at least for the reasons given with regard to the rejection under Section 102.

**Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito et al (6,782,717) in view of Saito et al (2003/0110803A1).**

Saito et al is discussed and distinguished above. The Examiner admits that Saito et al does not teach chemical strengthened glass substrates.

Saito et al '803 does not remedy the additional deficiencies of Saito et al, as noted above. In particular, Saito et al '803 does not teach how or why one skilled in the art would modify Saito et al to add (1) post texturing irrigation (2) use of a tape for cleaning, and (3) the recited ranges.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)  
U.S. Application No.: 10/790,111

Attorney Docket No.: Q80222

Since neither reference teaches the claim limitations, this rejection is overcome, at least for the reasons given with regard to the rejection under Section 102.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

*/Alan J. Kasper/*

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

---

Alan J. Kasper  
Registration No. 25,426

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 25, 2008